

The 25th May, 1973

No. 5284-4Lab-73/20618.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Mohinder Singh and Associates, 15/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 25 of 1973

between

SHRI MAN SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MOHINDER SINGH AND ASSOCIATES, 15/3, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:

Nemo for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/72/101280, dated 13th March, 1973 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Mohinder Singh and Associates, 15/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Man Singh was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Man Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Usual notices were given to the parties. The workman concerned has not turned up nor his authorised representative. The plea taken up on behalf of the management is that as a matter of fact, this workman had been charge-sheeted on 7th March, 1973 and after submitting his explanation on 9th March, 1973 he had approached the management for claiming of his account which was done and a sum of Rs. 125.60 was paid to him in full and final settlement of his entire claim, as per Voucher Exhibit M. 1 duly signed by him.

In view of the above, there is no dispute left between the parties. Shri Man Singh workman concerned has already settled his account and received his dues in full and final settlement of his entire claim against the management. He is not entitled to any further relief by way of reinstatement or payment of dues and apparently for that reason he has not come forward to pursue his claim. The award is accordingly made. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated the 15th May, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 514, dated the 17th May, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 15th May, 1973.

No. 5281-4Lab-73/20620.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Laxmi Rattan Engineering Works, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 3 of 1972

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAXMI RATTAN ENGINEERING WORKS,  
FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Onkar Parshad, for the workmen.  
Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/15-B-71/316, dated 5th January, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s. Lakshmi Rattan Engineering Works, Private Ltd., Faridabad and its workmen was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the lay off of the workers (list enclosed) was justified and in order ? if not, to what relief they are entitled to ?

Usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their respective written statements. The workmen reiterated their claim for full wages during the period of lay off as earlier raised through the demand notice dated 2nd June, 1971 giving rise to the present reference. The management contested their claim on merits and some legal objections were also raised. The following issues arose for determination:—

- (1) Whether the description of the respondent concern as given in the order of reference is wrong ? If so, with what effect ? (on management).
- (2) Whether the present dispute has been properly espoused ? If not, with what effect (on workman) ?
- (3) Whether the statement of claim has not been signed by a competent person, ? If so, with what effect ?
- (4) Whether the lay off of the workers (list enclosed) was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief they are entitled ?

The management has examined one witness Shri S. S. Joshi, Labour Officer M.W. 1, besides placing reliance upon certain documents including letter dated April 25, 1970, written to the Labour Commissioner, Haryana, Chandigarh, Exhibit M-1, reply received to the above letter Exhibit M-2, notice given to the Labour Commissioner in Form 'F' O-1, Exhibit M-3, copy of the Petition filed before the Sub-Judge, Ballabgarh Exhibit M-4.

On the other hand, three of the workmen concerned, namely, Sarvshri Dass Ram, Ramail Dass and Dewan Chand, have come into the witness box, the sum and substance of their deposition is that the management had laid off a large number of workmen who had put in long service ranging between 12 to 22 years and no reasonable ground had been shown for the lay off which was illegal. It has been further stated by them that before resorting to the lay off in question the management had brought under retrenchment some workmen.

The case has been argued on both sides and I have very carefully gone through the evidence on record oral as well as documentary. Nothing worth consideration has been urged with regard to issues Nos 1 and 3 which are decided against the management.

## Issue No. 2

The burden of this issue was on the workmen. A list of 226 workmen was enclosed with the order of reference who are stated to have been affected by the alleged illegal lay off. The demand notice leading present reference was given by the Engineering Mazdoor Union N. I. T., Faridabad. Nothing has been brought on record to indicate that the workmen concerned were members of the said union and what was their representation. No membership record has been produced nor have the proceedings of any meeting of the members been brought on record to indicate that they had resolved to raise a dispute and the said union had been authorised to take up the dispute on their behalf. In the absence of relevant evidence, oral as well as documentary, as discussed above, it is difficult to hold that a substantial number of the workmen of this establishment had espoused the dispute giving rise to the present reference. Shri Dewan Chand described as President of the said union and a signatory to the demand notice dated 2nd June, 1971 has come into the witness box as W. W. 3. From his statement even it is not clear that the present dispute had been espoused by a substantial number of the workmen of this establishment and they had taken the necessary steps to authorise the union to raise the dispute on their behalf nor is it clear from his statement that the union had representative character so far as the workmen of this establishment were concerned. The mere fact that the State Government has referred the dispute for adjudication as contemplated under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act is by itself not sufficient to prove that the dispute has been properly established. The issue No. 2 is, therefore, decided against the workmen for want of proof and it is held that there has been no proper espousal of the present dispute.

Since there was no proper espousal of the dispute, the subject-matter of the present reference within the meaning of the law it has to be held that no industrial dispute in fact existed between the parties which could validly be referred for adjudication. Even if it be assumed for the sake of arguments that the dispute had been properly espoused and the contention raised by the management in this regard is without any substance. The workmen concerned have not made out a good case for the acceptance of their demand for payment of full wages during the period of lay off. The management has brought on record the correspondence with the State Government to show that during the relevant period there was no market available for their products and there was huge piling of the

finished goods worth more than Rs. 20,00,000, as a result whereof further production had to be stopped and the work in the machine shop and the Assembly section had come to a standstill. In the circumstances the lay-off of the workmen concerned was unavoidable and the necessary notice was given by the management to the authorities concerned before resorting the lay-off. The contention raised by the workmen that no reason had been given by the management for the lay-off in question is not warranted by the facts on record nor has they been able to produce any cogent and convincing evidence to indicate that this lay-off had been resorted to by the management by way of victimisation of the workmen or undue labour practice. It is not their case that the wages to which they were otherwise entitled during the period of lay-off were not paid to them.

For the reason aforesaid, the issue No. 4 is decided in favour of the management and against the workmen and it is held that they are not entitled to any relief in the present reference. The award is made accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated the 10th May, 1973

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 515, dated the 17th May, 1973

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 10th May, 1973

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 5282-4Lab-73/21033.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act. No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Sunbeam Corporation, 17/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 110 of 1971

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SUNBEAM CORPORATION, 17/6,  
MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present—

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workmen.  
Nem, for the management.

#### AWARD

The workmen of M/s. Sunbeam Corporation, 17/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad, raised certain demands for bonus, dearness allowance and supply of uniforms which were referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. ID/FD/6(7-C-71/41022, dated 14th December, 1971, of the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

- (1) Whether the management should pay dearness allowance to the workers ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether the management should supply uniforms to the workers ? If so, with what details ?
- (3) Whether the management should pay bonus to the workers for the years 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70 ? If so, with what details ?

Usual notices were given to the parties. The management did not appear in spite of service. Shri Roshan Lal Sharma who gave the demand notice leading to the present reference filed the statement of claim on behalf of the workmen reiterating their above demands as earlier raised through the demand notice, dated 19th July, 1971. The management having chosen not to take part in the proceedings in spite of service, the workmen were directed

to lead their *ex parte* evidence. The case has been adjourned a number of times on the request of their authorised representative Shri Roshan Lal Sharma but no evidence has been adduced. He is present today but without any evidence, oral or documentary and states that he has no instructions from the workmen concerned to proceed with the case.

In the circumstances, the workmen concerned cannot be entitled to any relief in respect of the demands the subject-matter of the present reference, for want of proof to support their claim. The award is made accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated 15th May, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 511, dated 17th May, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 15th May, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 5283-4Lab-73/21035.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Mohinder Singh and Associates, 15/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 22 of 1973

between

SHRI HARI PANDEY WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MOHINDER SINGH AND ASSOCIATES, 15/3, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/72/10737, dated the 18th March, 1973, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Mohinder Singh and Associates, 15/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Hari Pandey was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Pandey was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Usual notices were given to the parties. The workman concerned has not appeared nor his authorised representative. On behalf of the management it has been stated that this workman who had joined service on 1st April, 1972, has continuously been working up-to-date and his services were never terminated by the management.

In view of the above there is no dispute between the parties which may call for adjudication by this tribunal. The services of the workman having never been terminated as stated by the authorised representative of the management, the question of his reinstatement or payment of back wages, etc., does not arise. The award is made accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 15th May, 1973.

No. 513, dated the 17th May, 1973

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 15th May, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.S. N. BHANOT,  
Commissioner for Labour and  
Employment & Secy.

## SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

The 18th May, 1973

No. 2736-SW-2-73/9680-84.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to make the following amendment in the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women" published,—*vide* Haryana Government notification No. 3825-SW-2-72/14447, dated the 29th August, 1972, and appeared in the HARYANA GOVERNMENT GAZETTE, dated the 12th September, 1972, namely :—

- These rules may be called the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women (First Amendment), 1973".

2. In the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women, 1972", after clause (v) of rule 2, the following new clause (vi) shall be added namely :—

(vi) Widows of deceased Defence personnel may be given priority in the matter of admission.

S. N. BHANOT,

Commissioner &amp; Secy.

## राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक 24 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 1156-ज(II)-73/15425.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उस में आज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है), की धारा 2(ए) (१ए) तथा 3(१ए) के अनुसार सीमे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री हरी सिंह, पुत्र लज्जा राम, गोव कर सिन्धु, तहसील सरीरों, जिला जींद, को खरीफ, 1965 से खी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर, सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहृदय प्रदान करते हैं।

दिनांक 25/26 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 855-ज(II)-73/15596.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उस में आज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है), की धारा 2(ए) (१ए) तथा 3(१ए) के अनुसार सीमे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल मिम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके सामने दी कराल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहृदय प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	रोहतक	श्री बनवारी, पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह	निजामपुर माजरा	खरीफ, 1965 से खी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150
2	रोहतक	श्री सूरज मल, पुत्र श्री प्रभु राम	सिसाना	खरीफ, 1965 से खी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150
3	रोहतक	श्री रघुनाथ सिंह, पुत्र श्री रोहतक अत्तर चन्द	रोहतक	खरीफ, 1965 से खी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
4	रोहतक	श्री पिल राम, पुत्र दीवाराम	ग्रामनिगर, रोहतक	रोहतक	खरीफ, 1965 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	रुपये 100 150
5	रोहतक	श्रीमती छोटा देवी, विधवा श्री दुल्ला राम	गोरिया	झज्जर	खरीफ, 1965 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150
6	रोहतक	श्रीमती भगवान कौर, विधवा श्री ज्वाला सिंह	कोसली	झज्जर	खरीफ, 1965 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150
7	रोहतक	श्री गांधी राम, पुत्र श्री बेग राज	सुनारीकलां	रोहतक	रवी, 1966 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150
8	रोहतक	श्री रखे राम, पुत्र श्री राम नारायण	खुर्मपुर	रोहतक	रवी, 1968 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100 150

क्रमांक 1061-ज(II)-73/15602.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसमें ग्राज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है), की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारीं का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री गुरदर्जन सिंह, पुत्र श्री गुरचरण सिंह, गांव हथबाला, तहसील व ज़िला जींद, को रवी, 1968 से रवी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर, सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

दिनांक 28 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 788-ज(I)-73/15829.—श्री जीवा राम, पुत्र श्री केहर, गांव रामवास, तहसील व ज़िला महेन्द्रगढ़, की मृत्यु के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल पूर्वी पंजाब जंगी जागीर अधिनियम, 1948, की धारा 4 के अधीन प्रदान की गई जक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सहर्ष अदेश देते हैं कि श्री जीवा राम की मुबलिक 150 रुपये की जागीर, जो कि उसे पंजाब/हरियाणा सरकार की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 10036-जे० एन०(III)-65/11181, दिनांक 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 तथा 5041-ग्रार०-III-70/29505, दिनांक 8 दिसम्बर, 1970 द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी, अब श्रीमती जीवनी, विधवा श्री जीवा राम के नाम, 20 नवम्बर, 1972 अर्थात् रवी, 1973 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक की दर से मंजूर की जाती है। इन अधिकारों का प्रयोग सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत किया जायेगा।

क्रमांक 3460-ज(I)-73/15834.—पूर्वी पंजाब के युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसमें ग्राज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है), की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(ए) के अनुसार सौंपे थे अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उन के सामने दी फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं:—

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	हिसार	श्री मुख राम, पुत्र श्री जीवन राम	सिरसा	सिरसा	खरीफ, 1965 से रवी, 1970 तक	रुपये 100
2	,	श्रीमती सिक्कोरी, वेवा श्री हर चन्द	जमाबड़ी	हांसी	खरीफ, 1970 से खरीफ, 1965 से रवी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	150 100 150 150

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
3	दिल्ली	श्री बेग राज, पुत्र श्री गंगा राम	मुटावा	हासी	खरीफ, 1967 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
4	"	श्रीमती नारायणी, विधवा श्री अमीर लाल	नलवा	"	खरीफ, 1970 से रबी, 1970 तक	150
5	"	श्री सेवा राम, पुत्र श्री कालू राम	जामसुख	दिल्ली	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150

क्रमांक 4890-ज(I)-72/15840.—श्री भट्टा राम, पुत्र श्री पुर्ज मिह, गांव भांडोर नीची, तहसील व ज़िला महेंद्रगढ़ की मृत्यु के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल पूर्वी पंजाब जागीर अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 4 के अंतीम प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महंपं आदेश देते हैं कि श्री भट्टा राम को मुक्तिक 150 रुपये की जागीर, जो कि उसे हरियाणा सरकार की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 165-आर(III)-69/8332, दिनांक 18 अप्रैल, 1969 तथा 5041-आर-III-73/29505, दिनांक 8 सिद्धम्बर 1970 द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी, अब श्रीमती धन्मी, विधवा श्री भट्टा राम के नाम 26 जून, 1970 अर्थात् खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये कार्यक की दर से मंजूर की जाती है। इन अधिकारों का प्रयोग सनद में दी गई फतों के अन्तर्गत किया जावेज।

दिनांक 29 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 5086-ज(I)-72/15991.—पूर्वी पंजाब के युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसाकि उस में आज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कौमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उन के सामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई फतों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	नारनील	प्रभू दयाल, पुत्र श्री फूसा राम	करोरा	महेंद्रगढ़	खरीफ, 1967 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150
2	"	मोहर मिह, पुत्र श्री जय राम	ग्रन्थावास	"	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से आगे	150
3	"	मवानी सहाप, पुत्र श्री रित्पाल सिंह	बड़कोदा	नारनील	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से आगे	150

क्रमांक	ज़िला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
4	नारनोल	भगवाना, पुत्र श्री रामू	खैरोली	नारनोल	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
5	..	श्रीमती छोटा देवी, विष्वा सीता राम	भागोत	महेन्द्रगढ़	खरीफ, 1970 से 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	150
6	..	श्रीमती चान्द कोर, विष्वा मौजी राम	मीनपुर	रिवाड़ी	खरीफ, 1970 से 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150

दिनांक 30 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 862-ज(1)-73/16102.—पूर्वी पंजाब के युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसमें आज तक हस्तियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हस्तियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वापिक वीमत वालों युद्ध जागीर उनके नामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई गतों के अनुसार महंड प्रदान करते हैं :—

क्रमांक	ज़िला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	भिवानी	श्री राम स्थलप, पुत्र खेम राम	मन्दोला	चरखी धार्दी	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
2	..	राज मल, पुत्र श्री बूढ़ी पिंड	इमलोटा	..	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
3	..	कल्हया, पुत्र श्री गोकल	होहकी	शादरी	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
4	..	मनी राम, पुत्र श्री बुला	समशपर	..	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150

क्रमांक 81-ज(1)-73/16108.—पूर्वी पंजाब के युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उस में आज तक हस्तियाणा सरकार द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग

करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके सामने दी फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्व प्रदान करते हैं:—

क्रमांक	ज़िला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	महेन्द्रगढ़	थोमती सांव गो देवी, विधवा मामन राम	माजसा बुदे	महेन्द्रगढ़	रबी, 1969 से रबी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100
2	„	श्री ईश्वर राम, पुत्र श्री वखतावर	मोहम्मदपुर हमीदखां	नारनील	रबी, 1966 से रबी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100
3	„	देवी सहाय, पुत्र श्री पूर्ण सिंह	दोमड़ा अहीर	महेन्द्रगढ़	रबी, 1969 से रबी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	150
4	„	प्रभ सिंह चौहान, पुत्र श्री मूरा सिंह	खोल	रिवाड़ी	रबी, 1969 से रबी, 1970 तक खरीफ, 1970 से	100

दिनांक 31 मई, 1973

क्रमांक 979-ज(II)-73/16263.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार इनियम, 1940 (जिसा कि उस में आज तक हरियाणा सरकार द्वारा नंशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3 (1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गये इधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके सामने दी फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्त के अनुसार महर्ष प्रदान करते हैं:—

क्रमांक	ज़िला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	राशि
1	नोनीपत्त	श्रीमती जीवनी देवी, विधवा श्री हारा चन्द	खंडराई	गोहाना	खरीफ, 1968 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150
2	„	श्रीमती चन्दरो देवी, विधवा श्री वखतावर सिंह	चुलकाना	नोनीपत्त	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150
3	„	श्रीमती सुख देवी, विधवा श्री वखतावर सिंह	कासणी	गोहाना	खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
					खरीफ, 1970 से	150

